

The claims in Group I are drawn to a subcombination, while the claims in Group II are drawn to a combination, including the subcombination. If Applicants elect to continue with the prosecution of the claims in Group II, the Examiner would be at liberty to conduct a search for the subcombination, as part of the combination. However, Applicants would sacrifice entitlement to the broader subcombination claims. If Applicants elect to prosecute the subcombination claims, and the claims are finally rejected, Applicants then must file a divisional to pursue the non-elected claims, which are drawn to a novel combination. Obviously, Applicants are entitled to promptly file a division without waiting to see the outcome of the prosecution of the subcombination claims, but if the subcombination claims are allowed, Applicants would be entitled to add claims drawn to the combination, as originally presented. The divisional application would then be pointless. This creates an undue burden on Applicants. In contrast, the Examiner, if Applicants were to elect to prosecute the claims to the combination, would have search for the claimed subcombination anyway, and this would not suffer an undue hardship. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request that the Election Requirement be withdrawn.

In the event that the Examiner does not find Applicants' arguments persuasive, Applicants provisionally elect to continue with the prosecution of Group I., Claims 1-15, which are drawn to the actuator.

Respectfully submitted,

Thedford N. Hitafter  
Reg. No. 38,490

MacMillan, Sobanski & Todd, LLC  
One Maritime Plaza, Fourth Floor  
720 Water Street  
Toledo, Ohio 43604  
(419) 255-5900